

COMPLETING MOZART'S REQUIEM:  
A DESCRIPTION AND DEFENSE OF THE PROCESS

BY

DR. BRETT ABIGANA  
MUSIC INSTRUCTOR  
BOSTON UNIVERSITY ACADEMY



## INTRODUCTION

Since Mozart's premature death just after midnight on December 5th 1791, multiple legends and anecdotes have surrounded the genesis and completion of his last unfinished work, *Requiem*. These myths are perpetuated in plays, operas, movies, and a kind of recorded gossip found only rarely in historical documents and discourse. Indeed, many collegiate music students are surprised to learn that Peter Shaffer's play *Amadeus* (subsequently a Best-Picture Winner in 1985) was based largely on a one-act opera by Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov entitled *Mozart and Salieri* and almost not at all on historical data. However, as my intention is a compositionally- and historically-informed completion of the *Requiem* and not a history thereof, I will not spend much time in the clarification of those remarkable tales. Suffice it to say that Mozart was not poisoned, and that there was never any credible evidence to that effect; that Antonio Salieri did not commission the *Requiem* as part of a plot to kill the composer and steal the music; that many people have attempted to complete the work, beginning with Mozart's students; that while there was a mysterious 'Gray Messenger', he was far from supernatural, being instead a clerk acting as agent for Franz, the Count von Walsegg who commissioned the *Requiem* to memorialize his deceased wife Anna and paid for all rights of ownership to the work; and that Mozart did often say that he felt he was writing the work for himself, although the fevered compositional agony often described in his final hours is probably not accurate, given the various maladies that killed him. While discounting these myths certainly diminishes the juiciness of the story, a closer examination of the music itself provides more than enough fodder to appease even the most creative gossip.

While researching the *Requiem* and its origins was always part of my preparation for performing the piece at BU Academy, I was not prepared for the almost fanatical obsession with which I approached learning the piece. It seemed the further I got into the historical, analytical, and compositional background of the work, the more dissatisfied I was with the traditional completion by Mozart's youngest student, Franz Xaver Süssmayr. Despite the fact that the majority of performances of the piece include Süssmayr's contribution, I came to realize that the only way I would be happy with our performance was if I completed the *Requiem* myself. After the initial terror subsided, I settled into a perpetual state of worry: was I qualified to undertake this project? Would my students be able to play whatever I came up with, knowing that there would not be a complete recording or score to which they could refer? How would my colleagues react to this venture? How would the musical world at large react, should word get out? And perhaps the most daunting question of all: would Mozart approve of the changes I made to the traditional completion of his final work? Indeed, how could I do Mozart justice without violating his final musical testament?

The answer to this final question was eventually supplied by my father who, in a frantic phone call during which I explained my worries, asked me if I loved the piece, to which I of course answered affirmatively. After a brief pause, he said, "Then you owe it to your students and to Mozart. You owe them your industry and creativity." As the reality of what I was going to attempt settled in, I reacted with the only word I thought appropriate given the circumstance. And Dad agreed with me.

Of course, Süssmayr's is not the only extant completion of the *Requiem*. Many others, presumably dissatisfied with the traditional version, have attempted to complete Mozart's final



work in a way befitting the hand of the master. But as I investigated these other completions, I came to a remarkable realization: comparatively few of them were by composers. Composers often have a unique way of analyzing music, and the lens through which they observe the work of others is colored by their compositional training and technique. As such, what I may see in a Mozart fragment is very different from what a theorist, musicologist, or conductor might see. I should say then that my attempt at completing this work does not represent an assertion that my predecessors were incorrect, or even that my version is comparatively more correct: merely that my version is in many respects different, and is the result of analyzing Mozart's intentions as seen through my own compositional lens, and subsequently attempting to realize those intentions in a compositional manner.

When attempting a project of this magnitude, a strict set of rules must be adhered to, and to that end, I settled on the following: (1) Preserve the integrity of Mozart's extant work; (2) Make musical guesses as to Mozart's intentions based on sketches and analysis; (3) Compose only in Mozart's style; (4) Use Süßmayr's contributions as the basis for the new completion, diverging only when his music appears to conflict with Mozart's perceived intentions; (5) Provide adequate justification for any and all choices resulting in a different musical outcome. What follows is attempt to satisfy this final rule.

## INSTRUMENTATION

Before addressing the specific choices I made, some small discussion should be devoted to the more global changes made to the score. Perhaps the most obvious difference concerns the instrumentation of my completion vs. Mozart's original score. Mozart composed for a darkly-scored Classical orchestra of two basset horns, two bassoons, two trumpets, three trombones, timpani, strings, organ, chorus, and solo quartet. In contrast, my instrumentation substitutes flutes for basset horns, omits the bassoons and trombones, adds a piano, and lays much of the orchestral part at the feet of the poor organist. This was not done in order to improve on Mozart's orchestration: rather, the different instrumentation reflects the instruments available to BU Academy.

While at first glance this significant change seems at odds with my first rule regarding this new completion, I maintain that Mozart would have approved the orchestrational change. As a composer, one must be a pragmatist, and Mozart understood that better than most. Whereas in the beginning and middle of his compositional career, I believe Mozart would have balked at a conductor changing his orchestration, the musical atmosphere had changed in the last few years of his life. War and the ensuing economic hardship had forced much of the aristocracy to disband their personal orchestras in favor of smaller chamber ensembles, and large musical events such as symphonic and operatic performances were increasingly rare. In addition, orchestral church music had been curtailed by Emperor Joseph II in an effort to reform the excesses of the Viennese clergy. Therefore, it would have been in Mozart's best business interest to compose for whatever instruments he might have had available, in order to ensure a

performance of his work. As larger ensembles were harder to form and finance, smaller chamber ensembles became more prevalent in the musical atmosphere.

This re-orchestration would not have been the first time Mozart's music had been so affected, even if carried out in his lifetime. As Imperial Royal Chamber Composer (a largely meaningless position intended only to prevent Mozart from seeking employment in foreign countries), one of his responsibilities was to produce dance music for the court balls held in the Redoutensaal of the Imperial Palace.<sup>1</sup> These dances were quite popular affairs wherein masked guests would eat, drink, dance, and engage in occasional *risqué* behavior, all to the constant sounds of the court orchestra. Mozart took as much care with these pieces as he did with his greatest operas and as such, the music was quite popular. Given the economic difficulty of maintaining a full orchestra, it would have been impractical to publish these works in their original instrumentation, so publishing houses would pay the composer a flat fee to purchase all rights to the music before arranging it for a smaller ensemble (or even solo keyboard) and selling it throughout Europe. While this practice was hardly to the financial benefit of the composer, who did not receive any royalties for the arranged music, it was expected that their music was to be reorchestrated and modified to fit whatever ensemble was at hand. Even Mozart was not immune from this arrangement.

The last aspect of the orchestration worth mentioning is in regards to the trumpets and timpani and their effect on the piece as a whole. There is certainly a temptation to expand upon the traditional role of the trumpets and timpani in the Classical era. Mozart had certainly expanded the role of the French horn in the composition of his wonderful concertos and *Concert*

---

<sup>1</sup> The Redoutensaal was a large, ornate ballroom in the palace. When combined with its twin ballroom, the resulting cavernous space was called the Redoutensäle, and could accommodate up to 3000 guests.



*Rondo*, but without the advent of valves to affect the harmonic series,<sup>2</sup> the trumpet is somewhat limited in its potential contribution to the work. Likewise, while there is some precedence for more than three pitches to be used in a timpani part over the course of one large work,<sup>3</sup> it was far from standard procedure, since the more modern tuning methods had yet to be invented. I think, given Mozart's affinity for stretching the boundaries of the Classical norm in his later works, had he access to valved trumpets and pedal timpani, he would have used them to full advantage; unfortunately the technology required simply did not exist as yet and so he was limited to fairly typical Classical usage of these instruments. As such, and in accordance with my set of rules, I made the decision to only write for trumpet and timpani according to their 18th-century abilities, expectations, and techniques.

---

<sup>2</sup> The harmonic series is the pattern of pitches playable on an instrument of fixed length. The primary pitch, called the fundamental, is only the first of many possible pitches, the intervals between which get progressively smaller as they get higher, resulting in closer and closer harmonics. This is perhaps most simply illustrated by exploring the harmonic potentials of a single string: by creating a node in the exact middle of the string, each side will vibrate opposite to its complement, even when only one side is plucked, blown, or struck. The divisions of the string resulting in higher harmonics progress from 1/2 to 1/3 to 1/4, etc. On a brass instrument, the concept is the same but relies on the buzzing of the player's lips as the tone generator. Valves therefore lengthen the instrument, resulting in a different harmonic series of pitches, thereby enabling chromatic tones outside of the key corresponding to the original harmonic series.

<sup>3</sup> Haydn's Symphony no. 94 is was of the earliest examples of this practice, as it requires both timpani to be retuned over the course of the symphony.



## INTROITUS AND KYRIE

A common misconception about the *Requiem* is that Mozart did not finish any of it. As it turns out however, this is not exactly true. In fact, the structurally significant portions of almost the entire work were completed by Mozart, which does give some insight into his compositional process. For the majority of the *Requiem*, the choral parts are completed along with significant accompaniment, usually in the form of a 2-4 measure fragment in the strings, and the figured bass.<sup>4</sup> This has a direct bearing on my interpretation of Mozart's process, and therefore on my own completion of the work, in that Mozart would have written only the most important notes first, relying on the figured bass and accompaniment figures to remind him of the details which, presumably, would be entered later. As such, the orchestra should be treated as hierarchically secondary to the chorus, and that any further accompaniment beyond what Mozart notates should be as a result of the text, not an end unto itself.

As the *Requiem* movement is the only completed movement, and as such, represents the only model for orchestration that may truly be used as a basis for a new completion, several seemingly mundane features become immediately significant. First, the winds in the orchestra deserve special attention, as they tend to double the chorus. As such, they are markedly different from the strings, which tend to have more rhythmically-based accompaniment which no doubt support the harmonic structure but also drive the music inexorably forward, often in contrast to

---

<sup>4</sup> Figured bass is the bassline of a given piece to which are added numbers, representing intervals above the note to which they are attached. A continuo player, often a harpsichordist, would then translate these intervals into notes, playing the resulting chords with the right hand while the left hand plays the written bassline. This practice is very similar to a contemporary jazz lead sheet, wherein chord symbols and a melody are given to a musician who is then expected to interpret and improvise accordingly. The practice of supplying figured bass for performance was no longer as popular at the end of the 18th century as it had been fifty years earlier, but was often used to remind the composer of his own intentions so that he may concentrate on the more general issues of composition before filling in the details. This is especially useful to a composer such as Mozart who often worked very quickly and presumably did not want to be hampered by details until necessary.



the almost Palestrina-like imitative vocal writing. This is not to say that the winds do not contribute to the forward-moving nature of the movement, but in comparison to the striking syncopation in the strings which marks the initial choral entrance, or the fiercely dotted rhythms heard in conjunction with the words “exaudi orationem meam,” the winds seem to occupy a largely melodic role in the movement.

While timpani and trumpets heard together is fairly typical for the Classical era, some few minor details are worth noticing. While the first three notes heard in the trumpets and timpani are an emphatic authentic cadence in the tonic,<sup>5</sup> the second entrance of these instrument contains an often overlooked rhythmic discrepancy. At the end of the opening statement on the words “eis Domine,” the timpani has a single dotted rhythm before the trumpet does (See Example 1). This tiny canonic figure suggests

that the timpani and trumpets need not be treated as two aspects of the same hybrid instrument; rather, they may act independently and can develop musical ideas as individual units, rather than being forced to merely double each other at significant cadential points. A similar distinction between the two instruments occurs in the final

measure of the Requiem movement wherein the timpani has sixteenth notes not heard in any other instrument, including the trumpet.

EXAMPLE 1



<sup>5</sup> A cadence is a natural ending ending to a phrase of music: a kind of musical punctuation. An authentic cadence is usually heard as V-I, wherein I represents the tonic (home key) of the piece, in this case d minor, and V represents the most natural antecedent thereof.



As Mozart did survive to finish the *Requiem* movement, it hardly seems necessary for me to justify merely re-orchestrating for our ensemble. But with the close of that movement, the orchestrational ease of the piece ceases, as Mozart's surviving music for the *Kyrie* contains naught but the choral parts and figured bass. The piece is a brilliantly written four-voice fugue in an older, Baroque style. Given the contrapuntal complexity of fugal form in general and of this fugue in particular, it would be somewhat superfluous to add a more contrapuntal orchestral accompaniment, especially in light of the fact that the continuo part, as completed by Mozart, merely doubles the bass and tenor parts. As such, the *colla parte*<sup>6</sup> accompaniment added after Mozart's death by Franz Jacob Freystädler<sup>7</sup> seems not only appropriate but also closely aligned with Mozart's perceived intentions. This is supported by careful scrutiny of the other complete fugue present in the *Offertory*, the *Quam Olim Abrahæ* which employs a constantly moving rhythmic accompaniment which does not double the chorus' fugue.

After orchestrating the winds in imitation of Freystädler's *colla parte* writing, the only remaining instruments were the timpani and trumpet. Given their strong cadential use in the *Requiem* movement, it seemed appropriate to use it similarly in the *Kyrie*, so despite the appearance of occasional single pitches at structurally unimportant moments in the traditional

---

<sup>6</sup> *Colla parte* literally means "with the soloist" and refers to the practice of doubling solo or, in this case, vocal parts verbatim in the orchestra.

<sup>7</sup> Freystädler was the first of Mozart's students to be commissioned by Constanze Mozart to complete the *Requiem*. He quickly gave up the project for unknown reasons after orchestrating the *Kyrie*. The second student commissioned, Joseph Eybler, also gave up after orchestrating only five sections of the Sequence. Abbé Maximilian Stadler may have been offered the commission next, but his role in the completion of the *Requiem* is far from clear. The vast majority of the work was completed by Franz Xaver Süssmayr, Mozart's youngest student, and it is his completion that represents the traditional version heard most frequently in contemporary performances. It is interesting to note that Süssmayr was the only one of these contributors to ever publicly admit having made a contribution to the completion of the *Requiem*, presumably out of respect for the work, for their teacher, and for Constanze who would stand to reap all of the financial benefits of the publication of her husband's final work.



completion,<sup>8</sup> I chose to employ a more sparse use of the timpani and trumpet, only using them in strong cadential or structurally significant instances. In keeping with the slight rhythmic development at work in the *Requiem* movement, they are not always rhythmically homophonic, although they are quite similar in most respects.

---

<sup>8</sup> These were more likely the work of Freystädler than of Süßmayr.

## DIES IRAE

Mozart's famous depiction of Judgement Day, as he left it, leaves much to the creative imagination. The autograph score consists of the choral parts along with the figured bass, as expected, and an almost complete Violin I part. In addition, the first four measures are fully realized in the strings, giving some small clue as to Mozart's orchestral intentions. Terrifyingly fast sixteenth notes in the strings alternate with heavily syncopated eighth note rhythms, often presented homophonically within the strings, while the winds are left blank, presumably due to their hierarchically unimportant nature in this setting.

Aside from the different realization of the figured bass which is usually the result of any new completion of this work, I made a conscious decision to maintain, as much as possible, the homophonic nature of the strings. Given the opening which relies on this homophony, broken only occasionally by accented chord tones in the Violin I and Viola, it seemed appropriate that the strings often act in rhythmic unison, emphasizing chord tones in order to give rhythmic thrust and harmonic stability to the movement. As such, there are many instances of tight, chordal harmony not often found in most completions. One example of this can be seen in measure five, wherein much tighter, homophonic harmonies can be seen in the strings in contrast to the traditional completion (See

Example 2).

I believe these instances are acceptable, and even intended, given the closed

EXAMPLE 2

*Süßmayr Completion*

*Abigaila Completion*

spacing<sup>9</sup> of the top three string parts in the beginning of the movement. In addition, these tighter harmonies seem in keeping with the dense voicing of the choral writing, which is usually homophonic and in close spacing throughout the movement.

---

<sup>9</sup> Closed spacing is when multiple chord tones are in their closest positions in relation to each other, resulting in a densely packed harmonic sonority.



## TUBA MIRUM

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of this movement is the opening trombone solo. Given the translation of the beginning text (“the trumpet, spreading its wondrous sound”), it would seem more fitting that the trumpet be the featured instrument. Why then would Mozart make the conscious decision to utilize the trombone instead? The answer of course lies within the confines of the 18th century trumpet which, lacking valves, was bound to the aforementioned harmonic series. As such, Mozart would have been quite limited in his modulatory possibilities, had he used the obvious instrumentation. His reliance on the trombone must therefore have been an acquiescence to the chromaticism needed in the opening solo, rather than a symbolic orchestrational choice.

Of course, the BU Academy Chamber Orchestra does not have a trombonist, so I was forced to use the trumpet as substitute. While purists will certainly balk at this change from Mozart’s original work and the negation of one of the most frequently played orchestral trombone excerpts from the 18th century, it is worth mentioning again that I believe Mozart would have approved the change, had the trumpet evolved to allow it by 1791. As a composer obviously very familiar with the translation of the Requiem text, the meaning of the word “tuba” would not have been lost on Mozart, and since he made every effort to paint the text whenever possible throughout the piece, he would certainly have taken advantage of the instrument in this situation. Furthermore, as a pragmatist, he would certainly have orchestrated appropriately had he been limited to our instrumentation.

In Süßmayr’s completion of the *Requiem*, the trombone makes a hesitant return to melodic importance in measure 24 on the words “Liber scriptus proferetur,” sung by the tenor

soloist. What I personally find interesting about this is that the trombone is absolutely superfluous to the texture and was not written by Mozart; in fact, the notes the trombone plays are not from Mozart's hand at all, but from Süßmayr's exclusively, and seem to be based only on conjecture. At this point in the autograph, the only two lines with music are those belonging to the basses and the tenor soloist. While Süßmayr's decision to retain the trombone soloist for future use in measure 24 is logical, it also flies in the face of the translation ("A written book shall be brought forth in which all shall be contained..."), and unlike the beginning of the movement, seems utterly disconnected from the text. For this reason, I have omitted this section of the trombone solo, choosing instead a simple accompaniment more in keeping with Mozart's style and intentions.

## REX TREMENDAE

The striking beginning of the *Rex Tremendae* is one of the most recognizable openings of any of Mozart's works. The terrifyingly insistent dotted rhythms throughout the movement are a clear reference to the French overture style<sup>10</sup> often employed in the 17th and 18th centuries to connote a certain noble or royal bearing, and offer the first clear picture of Mozart's word painting skills. Indeed, the combination of these inexorable dotted rhythms and the ferocity with which the chorus sings the opening phrase on the words "Rex tremendae majestatis" (translated as "King of terrifying majesty") is certainly enough to give one the chills.

But the entrance of the chorus seems somewhat out of place in the greater texture of the music at hand, due in part to its emphasis on the second beat, generally considered a weak place in the metric hierarchy of a measure. Even the strength of the chord as orchestrated is tempered somewhat by its metric location and the lack of any specified accompaniment to lend it stability (the dotted rhythms commence only after the chorus begins their note). Of course, far be it for me to criticize the Master's work, but I believe that Süßmayr also came to the same conclusion and added a single tonic chord in the winds to support the chorus in measure three; but more importantly, he added a tonic chord on the second beat of measure one as an anticipation of the choral entrance. While the chord in question in measure one is not written in the autograph score, I think in keeping with the improvisatory expectations of the organ part that its addition, in anticipation of the chorus' entrance two measures later, is certainly within the realm of possibility for performance. As this particular performance of the *Requiem* does not rely on the

---

<sup>10</sup> The French overture form is in two complementary sections, the first heavily dotted and slow, and the second fugal and faster. This form was popularized by, among others, Jean Baptiste Lully in his ballets and operas. French overture style, in most instances, refers to the imitation of the slow, stately, heavily dotted first section of the form.



improvisatory or theoretical skills of the organist however, I have added the written chord to the organ part. It must be fully understood though that I do so only in keeping with the performance practices of 18th century sacred music, not as a departure from or correction of Mozart's autograph score.

The rest of the movement follows in fairly unchanged fashion, with the exception of the final measures after the unison "salvas gratis" by the chorus. As the musical texture changes and leads us to the depths of Mozart's inner fear as evidenced by his unique treatment of the words "salva me," the final Neapolitan-oriented cadence<sup>11</sup> is often doubled by the strings in the orchestra. However, I see no specific reason why the chorus should be doubled at all, given the suspicious lack of string doubling in the entirety of the movement. In fact, the very words "salva me" are sung without homophonic accompaniment, and as such, I believe the entire last line should be performed without doubling the strings. Moreover, Mozart only entered the final measure in the Violin I part, and I have to believe that if doubling was intended as a significant accompanying figure at this point in the movement, it would have been included in the autograph.

---

<sup>11</sup> A Neapolitan is a Major chord built on the lowered second scale degree. It often functions as a pre-dominant chord (that is, it usually happens before V). In this movement, which at this point is in d minor, the Neapolitan chord is an E-flat Major chord which eventually moves to V before settling on the tonic chord.

## RECORDARE

The word painting in the *Recordare* is more veiled than in previous movements, and almost amounts to an inside joke on Mozart's part. The title translates to "think" or "remember" and as such, Mozart thought it appropriate to engage in a slightly more technical compositional technique. The canonic<sup>12</sup> writing in the movement is, unfortunately, only barely realized as he only completed the opening canonic sequence in the strings. After this completed fragment, only one voice of the canon is written, evidently to remind Mozart of his own intentions while leaving the canonic details for a later time. The quartet's parts are fully realized, as is the bass part (albeit without figured bass which, given the densely contrapuntal nature of the quartet would have been superfluous). While the completed vocal lines give no opportunity for elaboration, the minimal inclusion of the canonic sections leave much room for development. While the opening canon, completed in Mozart's hand, is complete, the composer's developmental tendencies suggest that later canons in the movement should be developed slightly further so as not to simply repeat the same material multiple times. Of course, the vocal lines do repeat themselves, transposed, but with a very different, more chromatic bassline and, of course, with different words. As such, there is a clear development of those repeated vocal sections, and therefore the canons should develop as well.

One example of the greater canonic variation explored coincides with the words, "tantus labor non sit cassus," which translates to "may such great labor not be in vain." The voices are canonically organized (albeit not in strict canonic form) for four measures, with the modulating bassline, inverted since first heard in the bass, in support. Süßmayr's completion utilizes canonic

---

<sup>12</sup> A canon is a musical device wherein multiple voices of the same music occur in staggered entrances relative to each other. One simple example is the tune *Row Row Row Your Boat* which is often sung as a repeating canon.



fragments as expected, but in similar motion and therefore in direct contradiction to the vocal lines which run in contrary motion to each other. In addition, the Violin I has a modulating version of the Cello's beginning counterpoint (See Example 3). Instead, I chose to focus on the canonic possibilities of only the

bassline as written by Mozart, and to acknowledge the contrary motion of the voices by inverting the counterpoint in the violins.

In the *Requiem*, Mozart was clearly concerned with musical forms,<sup>13</sup> and as this movement is clearly focused on canonic development, it only seems appropriate that every effort be made to extract every bit of canonic possibility from the material at hand.

### EXAMPLE 3

Example 3 displays a musical score for the Süßmayr Completion of Mozart's Requiem. The score is written for four voices (Soprano, Alto, Tenor, Bass) and includes instrumental parts for Violin I, Violin II, and Cello/Double Bass. The lyrics are: "tan - tus la - bor sey uns gnä - dig". The score is marked with a piano (*p*) dynamic. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and trills.

*Süßmayr Completion*

Example 3 also displays a musical score for the Abigaña Completion of Mozart's Requiem. The score is written for four voices (Soprano, Alto, Tenor, Bass) and includes instrumental parts for Violin I, Violin II, and Cello/Double Bass. The lyrics are: "tan - tus la - bor". The score is marked with a piano (*p*) dynamic. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and trills. A section of the score is marked with a 'D' in a box.

*Abigaña Completion*

<sup>13</sup> This is of course not to say that he was unconcerned with musical forms in his other works, but as this paper considers only the work at hand, I will leave the investigation of these other works to the interested reader.



## CONFUTATIS

I must admit to not having done anything to the *Confutatis*. This is not because there is no room to add to it; in fact, there are gaping holes in Mozart's autograph which leave much room for harmony and counterpoint. However, as Süßmayr was working closely with the Master during the compositional process, it seems likely that Mozart intended to write the *Confutatis* in at least a similar way to the traditional completion. As there is no evidence to support a departure from Süßmayr's realization of Mozart's wishes, I have not changed this movement except to orchestrate it for the ensemble at hand.

## LACRIMOSA

The *Lacrimosa* is perhaps the most recognizable and popular movement of the *Requiem*. As such, I should say that I do not change it lightly and would not do so at all if it weren't glaringly clear that Mozart would have written a very different piece. The autograph of the score consists of only eight measures, and they are not fully realized. After the famous two-measure introduction by the upper strings, the chorus continues with nothing but a simple bass line accompaniment, stopping after the words "homo reus".

In order to justify my changes to this beautiful movement, some small discussion to the harmonic structure of the *Requiem* at large should be attempted. A simple analysis of the key areas touched upon by Mozart in his completed movements (at least in those which have a complete figured bass, and therefore a complete harmonic structure) yields astonishing results. The *Confutatis* alone, even in its apparent simplicity, travels through no fewer than six keys, all within its brief forty measures. The *Tuba Mirum* goes through nine keys, and by some analyses, the *Recordare* touches on eighteen keys before its unassuming end. But the number of keys is perhaps not as important as the relationships between the keys. In general, simple harmony tends to proceed in fifths, often hinging on dominant/tonic relationships,<sup>14</sup> whereas the harmony in the *Requiem* tends to progress in thirds. While third harmonic progressions of thirds are easy in some cases,<sup>15</sup> Mozart seems to prefer modulations to non-relative keys. The chromaticism of the *Requiem* is easily overlooked since, as with most of Mozart's music, the modulations and harmonic surprises are so effortless as to never sound out of place or abrupt unless specifically

---

<sup>14</sup> Dominant/tonic relationships are constructed by establishing a key and, by the addition of a dissonant pitch, reinterpreting the tonic chord (I) as the dominant (V) of a new key. This is the simplest process of modulation (that is, changing keys), and can be found throughout the music of the tonal tradition.

<sup>15</sup> When in d minor, a modulation to F Major is easily done, since the two keys are relative to each other, meaning they share the same key signature.



desired. Even in obviously chromatic sections such as the final bars of the *Confutatis*, the complex harmonic motions never seem out of place. By contrast, those movements that seem to have no chromatic undertones do seem out of place and, upon investigation, are almost completely written by Süßmayr. The *Lacrimosa*, despite being one of the most heart-rending pieces in the Classical canon, contains only two different keys, and employs modulation by fifths, not thirds. As such, I believe Süßmayr was at a loss on how to finish the movement with so little given to him to work with.

A glance at Mozart's introduction confirms that chromaticism was to be a significant part of this movement. Over simple chord tones in the Violin II and Viola, the Violin I plays the famous sobbing motive, often dissonant with its own accompaniment, as in the case of the fourth beat, wherein a C-natural in the Violin II is clearly dissonant with the C-sharp in the Violin I. Despite Mozart's hint at the intended chromaticism, Süßmayr relies primarily on chord tones in his use of this sobbing motive, beginning in measure three on the words "qua resurget" (See Example 4). Instead of reinforcing chords that do not need lent strength, I chose to continue the step-wise motion of

#### EXAMPLE 4

The musical score for Example 4 is presented in two columns: 'Süßmayr Completion' on the left and 'Abigaña Completion' on the right. The score is for a vocal part with lyrics and a piano accompaniment. The lyrics are: 'qua re - sur - get / wann der Rich - ter'. The Süßmayr completion shows a vocal line with a sobbing motive and a piano accompaniment that is primarily chord tones. The Abigaña completion shows a vocal line with a sobbing motive and a piano accompaniment that is primarily chord tones. The Süßmayr completion is marked with a 'p' (piano) dynamic. The Abigaña completion is marked with a 'p' (piano) dynamic. The Süßmayr completion is marked with a 'p' (piano) dynamic. The Abigaña completion is marked with a 'p' (piano) dynamic.



the counterpoint as much as possible.

Süßmayr only utilized d minor and F Major, two relative keys, in his completion, although the F Major section is only three measures long. Given Mozart's chromatic and harmonic creativity, it seems more likely that he would have at least chosen keys with less in common. In addition, Süßmayr chose to ignore the significance of the final line of the *Sequenz* text: "Pie Jesu, Domine, dona eis requiem," which translates to "Merciful Lord Jesus, grant them eternal rest." Instead of highlighting only the last half of the final line, I chose to highlight both halves, repeating the previous line, "huic ergo parce deus" and modulating to F Major, similarly to Süßmayr. But instead of returning to d minor after a short time, I reinterpret F Major as a dominant of B-flat and repeat the opening motive of the movement in Major, engendering a third relationship between the original key of d minor and this new key of B-flat. There is substantially more chromaticism in this new section than in Süßmayr's completion, utilizing chords that, while quite chromatic, still remain within the Classical style. This Major section also attempts to acknowledge the change in lyrics to the final line. My brief departure returns to Süßmayr's completion on the words "dona eis requiem" and, with the exception of a slight embellishment of the counterpoint, mirrors his completion until the word "Amen."

The "Amen" is perhaps the most obvious departure from Süßmayr so far in my completion. The reason for this is most easily explained by examining the various sections of the entire *Requiem*. The *Introitus* ends with a fugal movement as do the *Offertorium*, *Sanctus*, *Benedictus*, and *Communio*. In short, Mozart clearly intended to end each major section of the *Requiem* with a fugue. It is therefore inexcusable that Süßmayr declined to write a fugue for the

*Amen*, instead choosing to end with a simple plagal cadence.<sup>16</sup> Furthermore, there is evidence to support that Mozart did in fact leave a fugal exposition fragment with his papers at his death.

The subject for this lost fugue is an inversion of a common melodic fragment found through the

*Requiem* (See Example 5) and, similarly to other fugue subjects therein, is first heard with the

EXAMPLE 5



countersubject. It is safe to assume that Mozart had intended this fugue subject for this piece, and that Süßmayr was either unaware of the sketch (which is doubtful considering the fact that Constanze gave him all of Mozart's sketches to aid in his completion), or lacked the ability or confidence to write a fugue worthy of Mozart's subject. Given Süßmayr's weak realization of the Osanna fugue at the end of the Sanctus and Benedictus sections, the latter two possibilities are quit probable. In keeping with Mozart's wishes and formal implications, I have constructed a four-voice fugue based on Mozart's sixteen-measure sketch, utilizing a wide modulatory spectrum and a variety of fugal procedures.

<sup>16</sup> Whereas V-I is an authentic cadence, IV-I is a plagal cadence. Plagal cadences are often found at the end of hymns in contemporary hymnals on the word "Amen."



## DOMINE JESU

As with some previous movements, Mozart's autograph of the *Domine Jesu* contains only the complete choral part as well as the bassline. Fragments appear in the violin parts, but only enough to remind Mozart of his accompaniment scheme. Given those fragments, Süßmayr's completion represents a well constructed realization of Mozart's intentions. The only changes that I made were in regards to orchestration. Specifically, in the imitative section on the words "ne absorbeat eas tartarus

### EXAMPLE 6

ne cadant in obscurum,"

Süßmayr's completion

calls for all strings to

double the sixteenth notes

Mozart intended for the

bassline (See Example 6).

The image displays two musical staves for Example 6. The top staff, labeled 'Süßmayr Completion', shows a complex, rapid sixteenth-note passage in a single line. The bottom staff, labeled 'Abigayña Completion', shows the same passage re-orchestrated for four string parts: Violin I (Vln. I), Violin II (Vln. II), Viola (Vla.), and Violoncello (Vc.). The Vln. I and Vln. II parts are marked with a 'C' time signature and contain simplified, staccato versions of the original sixteenth-note pattern. The Vla. and Vc. parts continue with the original, more complex sixteenth-note texture. The Vc. part is notably more difficult, as it effectively triples the number of people asked to play it.

While this bassline is notoriously difficult, it is made doubly so by effectively tripling the number of people asked to play it. Because of the difficulty of executing this unison section *en masse*, I have pared it down to only exist in the bassline with staccato pitches in the strings to emphasize harmonic movement. While this does make the section in question easier to play, this was not my reasoning for it; instead, I wanted to clarify the harmony and counterpoint by reducing the sixteenth notes to only what is required to remain true to Mozart's work.



## HOSTIAS

The *Hostias* is another of the movements which leaves fairly little to the creative imagination. The dense, homophonic voicing of the chorus in junction with the ever-moving bassline leaves little room for error in the harmonic content; indeed, the only things one must add are the syncopated Violin II and Viola, and the Violin I which, according to Mozart's fragment, can at times double the soprano part (presumably with some slight rhythmic deviation) and at others harmonize the syncopated counterpoint. Unlike Süßmayr's completion, wherein the Violin I alternates between the two options in two-measure half-phrases before finally settling on the syncopation (See Example 7), I decided to allow the Violin I to double the chorus exclusively, only

### EXAMPLE 7

gradually moving to the syncopated counterpoint over the course of the first part of the movement. In accordance with

The image displays two musical staves for the 'Hostias' movement. The top staff, labeled 'Larghetto.' and 'Süßmayr Completion', shows a single melodic line with a complex, syncopated rhythm. The bottom system, labeled 'Abigaña Completion', shows two staves: Violin I and Violin II. Violin I plays a simple, steady melody, while Violin II plays a more complex, syncopated melody. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and bar lines.

Mozart's autograph, the syncopation is definitively present in the Violin I for the last nine measures before the return of the *Quam Olim Abrahæ* fugue.

## SANCTUS

The *Sanctus*, in Süßmayr's completion, is fraught with problems. Besides the obvious errors in voice-leading, small details such as the disappointing repeated sixteenth-note triads in the strings at the beginning and odd doubling of trumpets with chorus seem to defy Mozartian influence. However, there is ample evidence to suggest that Süßmayr may have been in some ways faithful to Mozart's intentions, even if he lacked the compositional technique to completely realize them.

The style of the *Sanctus* is remarkably Handelian, in that it bears a striking resemblance to the introduction of the first *Coronation Anthem*, composed in 1727 for King George II of Great Britain. In that work, Handel takes full advantage of the descending chromatic line in order to facilitate modulation to the dominant before returning to the tonic; indeed, there are parts of the *Sanctus* which seem to be taken directly from Handel. This is hardly a surprise, given the many similarities to Handel to be found in other parts of the *Requiem*. Mozart, as is well-known, had a special affinity for Handel's music, going so far as to orchestrate the *Messiah* for the ensemble most commonly heard in contemporary performances. As far as the *Requiem* is concerned, the opening progression of the *Introitus* is almost identical to Handel's *Funeral Anthem*, HWV 264. In addition, the *Kyrie* fugue may be found, albeit in a Major key and with a slightly modified countersubject, in Handel's *Dettingen Anthem*, HWV 265.<sup>17</sup> Handelian influence in the *Requiem* was even mentioned by Abbé Maximilian Stadler, who was largely responsible for handling Mozart's musical estate and for determining the *Requiem*'s authorship.

---

<sup>17</sup> It must be understood that in the 18th century, this kind of "borrowing" was not only acceptable, but quite common. Composers would often find motives, fragments, harmonic devices, and even whole melodies in works of their contemporaries, and in turn use them in their own music, developing and expanding upon them in their own style, and achieving an original result.



As it can hardly be denied that Mozart looked to Handel for inspiration if not actual source material, it is no surprise that the *Sanctus* bears a heavy resemblance. Therefore, much of my completion of the *Sanctus* is in an effort to reconcile Mozartian style with Handelian influence.

Inasmuch as the autograph score of the *Sanctus* is exclusively in Süßmayr's hand and therefore is not the product of Mozart's direct composition, certain aspects of the movement would seem to suggest the hand of the master at work, rather than that of the student. First, the opening five measures of the soprano part are almost exactly taken from the opening of the *Dies Irae*. In addition, the fugue subject with its odd syncopation and tritone seems too radical for Süßmayr, considering his other work. I might also point out that the fugue subject bears a striking resemblance to the *Quam Olim Abrahæ* fugue subject, with its syncopation and tritone-heavy contour. Süßmayr was given all of Mozart's papers and sketches as tools to help with his completion of the *Requiem*, and it is quite possible that sketches for later movements attributed solely to Süßmayr were therein contained.

In the beginning of the movement, after the initial chord on the first two beats, the strings repeat sixteenth-note triads. I find this to be somewhat contrary to Mozart's contrapuntal tendencies, as shown throughout the *Requiem*. As such, I have changed those repeated sixteenth-notes to arpeggiated chords which continue until the fugue begins. In keeping with Mozart's closely spaced harmonic tendencies and my own closed spacing in the *Dies Irae*, these arpeggios are quite dense.

In addition, I have changed the trumpet parts to reflect the timpani's thirty-second-note flourishes. I find it unlikely that Mozart would have homophonically doubled the chorus with the trumpets: as such, the flourishes seem appropriately Baroque.



Lastly, I have changed the voice-leading between the fifth and sixth measures. In Süßmayr's completion, a chromatic cross-relation<sup>18</sup> jars the harmony from the relative comfort of the dominant to a secondary

#### EXAMPLE 8

function chord<sup>19</sup> (See Example 8). This voice-leading error is clearly not typical of Mozart's style, which displays an almost effortless transition between

The image displays two musical staves for a vocal passage, comparing two different completions. The left staff is labeled 'Süßmayr Completion' and the right staff is labeled 'Abigarría Completion'. Both staves show four vocal parts: Soprano (S.), Alto (A.), Tenor (T.), and Bass (B.). The lyrics are 'Sa - ba - oth, ple - ni sunt' and 'Him - mel und Er -'. The Süßmayr completion shows a chromatic cross-relation in the tenor part between measures 5 and 6, while the Abigarría completion shows a smoother voice-leading transition.

key areas. As such, I have changed the voice-leading so that the altos begin the secondary function chord with a common tone with the previous dominant chord, thereby softening the transition without compromising the harmony. In addition, a voice-leading correction has been made to the alto part on the word “Sabaoth” where, in Süßmayr’s completion, an implied tritone resolves incorrectly with a G moving to A. I have changed the chord from a diminished vii chord to a V chord, removing the source of the incorrect resolution.

Finally, the fugue in Süßmayr’s completion can hardly be called a fugue. Exhibiting, as it does, a profound lack of modulation and fugal procedure, it hardly does justice to what may be Mozart’s subject. As such, I have supplied a much lengthier fugue which takes advantage of fugal procedures including stretto and augmentation, while modulating through several

<sup>18</sup> A chromatic cross-relation refers to the presence of a consecutive and melodic chromatic half-step. In this case, the tenors have a C-sharp at the end of measure five while the basses begin measure six on a C-natural with no preparatory harmony to bridge the gap.

<sup>19</sup> Secondary function is the practice of “borrowing” a chord from another key, often in order to clarify or strengthen a harmonic movement in the tonic key.

diatonically related keys, as well as non-diatonically related keys. The fugue ends similarly to Süßmayr's, with an emphatic homophonic cadential treatment of the words "in excelsis." I believe this to be more representative of Mozart's fugal intentions.



## BENEDICTUS

As with many of Süßmayr's contributions to the *Requiem*, the *Benedictus* suffers from a profound lack of modulatory variety. As originally written, it modulates from the tonic to the dominant twice and briefly to the sub-dominant,<sup>20</sup> but does not venture further. As discussed, Mozart was fond of modulating to keys related by thirds, and to other keys further removed from the norm. Therefore, perhaps the most significant change to the *Benedictus* is that of key area. Whereas Süßmayr's completion utilizes only the aforementioned two key areas, mine attempts to recontextualize the main melodic motive in a minor, before modulating through e minor, f minor, and E-flat Major. This

modulatory section is an addition before Süßmayr's restatement of the primary theme in the sub-dominant (See Example 9). During this series of modulations, and in keeping with Mozart's style of development, the main melodic material is recycled as it were, briefly used in canonic imitation, and

EXAMPLE 9

Süßmayr Completion

Abigayle Completion

<sup>20</sup> Sub-dominant refers to a chord built on the fourth scale degree. Whereas I is called tonic and V is called dominant, IV is the sub-dominant. IV and V can both move easily to I, but V cannot move to IV traditional harmony, whereas IV can move to V.



becomes the impetus for the modulatory devices used.

The other significant change I made to the *Benedictus* involves the last few measures before the reoccurrence of the *Osanna* fugue, and of course the fugue itself. Given Mozart's harmonic structure within the entire *Requiem*, it seems unlikely that he would have ended the *Benedictus* in B-flat, as Süßmayr does.

In fact, in the movements that Mozart completed, he seemed to have a very firm harmonic scheme in mind (See Example 10).

Clearly, motivically and lyrically identical movements should be harmonically identical as well. As such, the *Introitus* and *Kyrie* which return at the end of the *Requiem* in the form of the *Lux Aeterna* and *Cum Sanctis* are exactly the same, except for the fact that the music for the *Lux Aeterna* starts, as it were, half-way through the original movement. Similarly, the repeated *Quam Olim Abrahæ* fugues are exactly the

same, despite the *Hostias*' key of E-flat. In fact, the arrangement of keys in the third section of the *Requiem* is exactly the same as the keys in the fourth section, if you discount Süßmayr's

### EXAMPLE 10

Movement	Primary Tonal Content
Introitus	d
Kyrie	d
Dies Irae	d
Tuba Mirum	Bb
Rex Tremendae	g to d
Recordare	F
Confutatis	a to F
Lacrimosa	d
Domine Jesu	g
Quam Olim	g
Hostias	Eb
Quam Olim	g
Sanctus	D
Osanna	D
Benedictus	Bb
Osanna	<del>Bb</del> D
Agnus Dei	d
Lux Aeterna	d
Cum Sanctis	d

error. This inner key scheme is typical of Mozart's formal tendencies, and as such, should be maintained. To that end, I have changed the final bars of the *Benedictus* in order to modulate back to D Major for the *Osanna* fugue. This restated fugue appears exactly the same with the exception of the final few notes in the chorus, which use a higher voicing for greater energy (See Example 11).

### EXAMPLE 11

in ex - cel - sis in ex - cel - sis.  
in ex - cel - sis in ex - cel - sis.  
in ex - cel - sis in ex - cel - sis.  
in ex - cel - sis in ex - cel - sis.

*Abigaña:  
Osanna Ending in Sanctus*

in ex - cel - sis in ex - cel - sis.  
in ex - cel - sis in ex - cel - sis.  
in ex - cel - sis in ex - cel - sis.  
in ex - cel - sis in ex - cel - sis.

*Abigaña:  
Osanna Ending in Benedictus*



## AGNUS DEI

The *Agnus Dei* presents certain problems for those who would revise it. Given Süßmayr's music, it seems unlikely that the *Agnus Dei* is entirely his work. The chromaticism of the Violin I part alone would seem to imply that Mozart was intimately involved with the movement, but of course no autograph of the movement in Mozart's hand exists. Perhaps the motives for this movement could have been found in the "scraps of paper" given to Süßmayr to aid in his completion. Or perhaps Süßmayr, in this one movement, lived up to his teacher's name by actually composing the movement. I personally believe this last possibility to be remote, given Süßmayr's demonstrated mediocre technical, modulatory, and expressive skills. I would prefer to believe that Mozart left some vision of this movement to Süßmayr, perhaps by way of his papers, and that the student tried to reconstruct the voice of the master.

The chromatic violin part bears a striking resemblance to the kind of chromaticism found in the *Lacrimosa*. As such, I have not changed it beyond fixing some of the voice leading and occasionally transposing the line to fit a longer contour, something often found in Mozart's work. The majority of my changes are to the sections with the text, "dona eis requiem." The first such section, in Süßmayr's completion, exhibits some melodic embellishment (See Example 12), and

### EXAMPLE 12

*p. assai.*

do - na e - is re - qui - em!  
sanfte Ru - he gieb uns Herr!

do - na e - is re - qui - em!  
sanfte Ru - he gieb uns Herr!

do - na e - is re - qui - em!  
sanfte Ru - he gieb uns Herr!

*p. assai.*

do - na, do - na e - is re - qui - em!

*Süßmayr Completion*

do - na e - is re - qui - em.

do - na e - is re - qui - em.

do - na e - is re - qui - em.

do - na e - is re - qui - em.

*Abigaña Completion*

while these notes are certainly within Mozart's style, I believe Mozart would have added them gradually so that the phrase could not be anticipated. Therefore, I took the melodic embellishments out of this first phrase and limited the notes to simple chord tones. In addition, I began the phrase on a unison F to allow each contrapuntal line to spring from a single place, and to allow for a more directionally charged progression. The second such phrase was likewise changed to provide more melodic embellishment, but there are comparatively few chromatic pitches in order to have something yet to aim for in the final phrase. The final "dona eis requiem" phrase finally returns to Süßmayr's original, having gradually become more melodically complicated since the words were first heard.

The final note of this phrase, in my opinion, is entirely too chromatic to have been the result of Süßmayr's creativity. Put bluntly, his modulatory skills as exhibited in his completion of the *Benedictus* (among others) would seem to deny his having any part in this last cadence. As such, I maintain that this cadence was Mozart's work. Furthermore, the chromaticism is hardly resolved appropriately in Süßmayr's completion; this odd cadence craves a longer journey to final resolution. I have therefore lengthened the final progression and allowed the chromaticism to continue through the distant keys of G-flat, e-flat minor, and c minor before coming to rest on the dominant of B-flat Major in preparation for the *Lux Aeterna* (See Example 13).



### EXAMPLE 13

sem - pi - ter  
ew' - ge, ew'

sem - pi - ter  
ew' - ge, ew'

sem - pi - ter  
ew' - ge, ew'

sem - pi - ter

cres

cres

cres

cres

ge Ru

nam.  
he!

nam.  
he!

nam.  
he!

nam.

#### *Süßmayr Completion*

sem - pi - ter

sem - pi - ter

sem - pi - ter

sem - pi - ter

nam

nam

nam

nam

sem

sem

sem

sem

pi - ter

pi - ter

pi - ter

pi - ter

nam.

nam.

nam.

nam.

#### *Abigaña Completion*

## LUX AETERNA AND CUM SANCTIS

These two final movements, in keeping with Süßmayr's completion, are taken from the *Introitus*, with only small prosodic changes allowed for varying syllabic content. There is some doubt as to whether Mozart intended to repeat the music from the previous movements, since this manner of clear repetition of an entire movement does not happen in the *Requiem*. However, I believe that left to his own devices, Süßmayr would most probably have clumsily repeated the entire *Introitus*, rather than starting in the middle of the movement. Doing so would have displayed a profound lack of knowledge of Mozart's intentions, as implied by his sketches and notes.

Mozart clearly thought highly of the fugue as a form in the *Requiem*. But an examination of the moments he chooses to use fugue as a developmental technique reveals that he did so only on the parts of the Requiem text that are oldest in comparison to the rest. Indeed, "Kyrie Eleison" is the last holdout of Greek among Latin texts in the Roman Rite. These textual references to the older church surely deserved an older form in which to showcase them and set them apart.

Mozart makes every effort to couch older forms in newer music; as discussed, he even goes so far as to begin the *Requiem* with borrowed music. Although the source of Mozart's ideas may not be original, the development of those ideas is certainly unique. Given Mozart's genius, I can hardly believe these to be arbitrary occurrences. If Mozart truly believed he could display old music and musical styles in a new way, and if the *Requiem*, as it does, exhibits common themes and motives that develop linearly throughout, then the return of the opening music at the end of the work must represent a new way of looking at previous material. The restatement of



the music from the *Introitus* is strangely comforting, coming as it does after the intense chromaticism that has been steadily building throughout the piece. It is no wonder then that audiences seem to utter a sigh of relief when they hear the familiar strains of the *Lux Aeterna*. This new way of observing old music would only be demonstrated by beginning the *Lux Aeterna* in the middle, as it were, and therefore I believe this ending to be firmly in keeping with Mozart's formal intentions.

## CONCLUSION

Perhaps the most daunting question I can ask myself is one which I studiously avoided until a week before the performance of this completion of Mozart's *Requiem*. M. R., a member of the BU Academy Chamber Orchestra came to me after school and asked simply, "Do you think he would like it?" I admit to being terrified of that very question, even now. The consuming doubt with which I approached this project has never left me, and now that I am forced face it, I am honestly not certain I have a satisfactory answer. The only answer I have is, "I hope so."

My saving grace in this project, oddly, has been the one thing that necessitates its completion: that Mozart is not alive to tell me I'm wrong. All I or anyone else can do is to examine the evidence available to us, applying our own training, technique, knowledge, and background, and make educated guesses as to Mozart's intentions. As previously stated, I do not maintain that my completion is any better than any other: it is just different. For all of his compositional faults, Süßmayr had one advantage which must necessarily demand our acknowledgment of his completion: he worked with Mozart in person and frequently had discussions with him about his intentions for the *Requiem*. That is an experience that no other musician to take on this challenge has had, or will have, and that makes the job much more difficult. I do not believe my compositional skills equal to Mozart's, but I believe by examining his autograph through a composers' eyes and taking a few more risks than most of my predecessors, I may have been able to exhibit a different possibility for the work that Mozart had intended. In the end, I hope he would have been proud of my work, even if I got it completely wrong.



There is one more feature of my completion that deserves mention, and I hope sums up my experience with this project. Above the final phrase in the *Agnus Dei* is written “*Una preghiera di ringraziamento dallo studente al Maestro*,” which means, “A prayer of thanks from the student to the Master.” I freely admit that this phrase does not appear in Mozart’s autograph nor, to the best of my knowledge, in any other completion of the *Requiem* including Süßmayr’s. While it may not be historically accurate and certainly does not represent Mozart’s intentions, I couldn’t help but to offer my thanks to Mozart (*il Maestro*) for this astounding piece of music, even in its fragmented form, and for the opportunity it affords us to learn from an examination of his genius.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Mozart, Wolfgang Amadé and Brett Abigaña. *Requiem in d minor*. Boston: Brett Abigaña Publishing, 2012.

Mozart, Wolfgang Amadé and Franz Xaver Süßmayr. *Requiem in d minor*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1810.